DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 748 SP 010 801

AUTHOR Jacko, Carol M.; Karmos, Ann H.
TITLE The University Supervisor: What Place in Academe?
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting, Association of Teacher Educators (57th, Atlanta, Georgia, February 2-5, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Supervisors; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Evaluation; *Measurement Instruments; *Role Perception

ABSTRACT

Because the role of university supervisor of student teachers differs from that of the typical on-campus instructor, the evaluation of university supervisors for tenure and promotion is often difficult. One criteria for tenure and promotion universally accepted in academe is that of teaching expertise. The authors designed an evaluation form that met the format requirements of the university-wide evaluation of teaching used at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, yet contained items that reflected the unique role of the university supervisor. This Center Coordinator Evaluation Form, presented in the paper, consists of a single sheet, varying for each of the three groups responding--student teachers, cooperating teachers, and public school administrators. The items are printed on mark-sensitive paper with open-ended questions on the back. A Likert-type scale is used for the response options. Each individual supervisor receives a computer printout of the results. A computer printout of the combined data of the program is also provided. The Center Coordinator Evaluation Form is now the vehicle for evaluating university supervisors at Southern Illinois University. (Author/MB)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED135748

# THE UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR: WHAT PLACE IN ACADEME?

by

Carol M. Jacko Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

Ann H. Karmos, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

College of Education
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale

SP010 801

As university faculty members, supervisors of student teachers have a unique role. The fact that they are on the road, out in the field, and everything from consultant to ombudsmen to both student teachers and cooperating teachers makes them a singular variety of university personnel when compared to the typical on-campus faculty instructor. This singularity, however, is not without its difficulties. A practical concern of university supervisors, other faculty, and university administrators alike is that of tenure and promotion. At SIU the Professional Education Experiences faculty in the department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media consists of the coordinators of fifteen student teaching centers. We are full-time supervisors and almost all of our time is spent in the public schools. We feel that the nature of our positions requires different criteria for evaluation than that of on-campus faculty members. In the fall of 1975, we focused our efforts to bring about change.

One criteria for tenure and promotion universally accepted in academe is that of teaching expertise. Consequently, we focused on evaluation of teaching as it applies to the university supervisor. An evaluation form was designed that met the format requirements of the university-wide evaluation of teaching used at Souther Illinois University at Carbondale, yet contained items which reflected the unique role of the university supervisor. This Center Coordinator Evaluation Form was pilot tested in the field for two semesters, revised during the following summer, and is now the vehicle for evaluating university supervisors at Southern Illinois University.

Development of a Center Coordinator Evaluation Form

Using the role description for Center Coordinators at Southern Illinois

University at Carbondale (those full-time faculty members who supervise pre-student teaching and student teaching field experiences in fifteen student teaching centers), items were generated which reflected duties, responsibilities, and attitudes as they related to student teachers, cooperating teachers, and public school administrators. A Likert-type scale was used with response options of "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." First draft items were circulated among the entire Professional Education Experiences staff and appropriate revisions were made.

At the end of the Fall 1975 and Spring 1976 semesters, the three evaluation instruments were pilot tested in several centers. Suggestions for improvement were solicited from student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administrators who responded to the evaluation. During the summer of 1976, the three forms were revised.

Personnel in the field suggested that space be provided for additional comments and general remarks. Respondents felt that a rating scale limited their ability to provide individual and concrete feedback to the coordinators. Several open-ended questions were added to meet this need for greater flexibility of response. The response option "Neither Agree nor Disagree" was changed to "Not Applicable" on the student teacher and cooperating teacher forms. Input from these respondents indicated that "Neither Agree nor Disagree" had been used for both neutral opinions as well as for situations which did not occur. One item for instance, read: "The center coordinator helped me deal with problems that developed during my student teaching experience." When the respondent perceived that no problems existed, a "Neither Agree nor Disagree" response did not provide any useful information

to the coordinator. This same response option was changed to "Not Observable" on the administrator's form. Since some administrators work more closely with university supervisors than others, "Not Observable" was a more realistic option. Several negatively stated items had been included in the original instruments to encourage respondents to read the items thoroughly and thus limit the number of individuals who would casually mark the form. Overwhelmingly, respondents said they found these items "confusing." Consequently, they were reworded in the positive.

Major revision of the forms was a matter of eliminating items which seemed redundant and tended to lengthen the form. The writers implemented suggestions for deleting or combining items in order to have a concise, easy-to-complete form whose return rate would be high. In addition, revisions were made which helped to clarify the circumstances of a given item. An item on the cooperating teacher form reading, "The center coordinator encouraged communication between my student teacher and me," became "The center coordinator encouraged communication between my student teacher and me, if the need arose." The qualifying prepositional phrase assured that respondents who did not perceive communication problems nevertheless would be able to evaluate the coordinator's awareness of the importance and value of communication.

After revision, the items were printed on one side of mark-sensitive sheets and the open-ended questions on the back. The Center Coordinator Evaluation Forms which resulted from this revision process and have been in use since Fall 1976 consisted of a single sheet, a different one for each of the three groups--student teachers, cooperating teachers, and public

school administrators.

STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATION OF CENTER COORDINATOR

The Center Coordinator:

1. Maintained an attitude of encouragement and showed interest in my progress.
2. Made himself/herself available when needed.
3. Was willing to help me if professional or personal problems developed during my student teaching.
4. Encouraged communication between my cooperating teacher and me, if the need arose.
5. Was effective in communicating SIU's expectations about student teaching.
6. Suggested activities, methods, or resources that enrichsed my student teaching experience.
7. Views of my teaching skills were based on specific classroom events which he/she observed.
8. Encouraged me to be self-evaluative.
9. Provided relevant and useful feedback about my teaching skills.
10. Made a positive contribution to my student teaching experience.
11. Set a good example as a professional.

1. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be continued (i.e. remain unchanged)?
2. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be changed or discontinued?
3. In your opinion, were the student teaching seminars helpful? What changes, if any, would you like to see in the seminars?
4. Please make additional comments and/or suggestions here:

COOPERATING TEACHER EVALUATION OF CENTER COORDINATOR

The Center Coordinator:

1. Was effective as a liaison between the university and me.
2. Respected my position as a professional colleague.
3. Helped me understand my duties and responsibilities as a supervising teacher.
4. Made clear the nature of his/her role as center coordinator.
5. Worked with me in an attempt to alleviate acutal or potential problems regarding my student teacher.
6. Made me feel comfortable about communicating my observations or concerns about the student teacher.
7. Showed concern about the progress of my student teacher.
8. Encouraged communication between my student teacher and me, if the need arose.
9. Cooperated with me in communicating to the student teacher the areas in which he/she needed to improve.
10. Was flexible in adjusting to changes in my schedule.
11. Made suggestions to my student teacher which were compatible with my classroom instruction and procedures.

12. Worked cooperatively with me on the student teacher mid-term and final evaluations.
13. Made a positive contribution to my experience with my student teacher.
14. Set a good example as a professional.

1. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be continued (i.e. remain unchanged)?
2. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be changed or discontinued?
3. What, in your opinion, is the center coordinator failing to do or achieve that should be done?
4. Please make additional comments and/or suggestions here:

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OF CENTER COORDINATOR

The Center Coordinator:

1. Was effective as a liaison between SIU and my school.
2. Respected the policies and procedures of my school.
3. Kept me informed of any situations and problems involving student teachers in my building which required my attention.
4. Worked well with my teachers.
5. Had a positive attitude toward education.
6. Contributed positively to the student teacher and pre-student teaching experiences in my building.
7. Set a good example as a professional.

1. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be continued (i.e. remain unchanged)?
2. What, in your opinion, does the center coordinator do that should be changed or discontinued?
3. What, in your opinion, is the center coorinator failing to do or achieve that should be done?
4. Please made additional comments and/or suggestions here:

Future of the Center Coordinator Evaluation Form

From the first pilot test on through revision and finalization, the Office of Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Center at SIU received results of evaluations. They provided a computer printout of each individual coordinator's results as well as a printout of the combined results of the program. This gave the coordinator an opportunity to compare individual results with those of the group. Now that the form has been used for three

semesters, some coordinators are able to compare their results longitudinally. A minor benefit of the computer printout is that it "looks like" the printout of the campus-wide evaluation form for on-campus faculty and thus enhances its credibility. In the eyes of those who review promotion and tenure folders, university supervisors' credentials need not look "different."

At the end of the Spring 1977 semester, questions regarding characteristics of student teacher respondents will be added to the form so that research may be done in the area of evaluation of instruction. Data is presently being stored so that norms for the items can be determined. Soon, coordinators will be able to better use the information that is collected.

Recently, a center coordinator who had placed printouts of his evaluations in his promotion folder came up before the promotion and tenure review committee. He commented that his evaluations of field work via the forms had been a decisive factor in a favorable decision. We feel we have begun to help university supervisors gain a place in academe.